



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,332	06/15/2000	Ryan W. Battle	MS1-0826US	8527
22801	7590	07/02/2007	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/594,332	BATTLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffrey R. Swearingen. (3)\_\_\_\_\_

(2) Emmanuel Rivera. (4)\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 13 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Win.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**JASON CARDONE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant was asked on June 6, 2007 to submit claim amendments for the interview. Applicant's request for an interview stated "I will contact you tomorrow as to the amendments." Applicant was contact on June 7, 2007 for the claim amendments. Applicant declined to submit claim amendments. At the beginning of the interview on June 13, 2007, Applicant was asked again for any appropriate claim amendments. Applicant had not prepared any amendments in time for the interview. Applicant attempted to argue the Win reference failed to teach setting cookies to a zero value. Applicant was asked to explain the difference between Win and the claimed invention. Applicant was unable to explain a difference between Win and the claimed invention beyond "setting the cookies to a zero value." Applicant was informed that "setting cookies to a zero value" had many interpretations, including expiring the cookies as in both Win and the specification for the instant application. Applicant parted from the topics of the agenda to argue Win failed to teach setting a cookie to a past expiration time. Applicant was unable to explain how a cookie could both have a zero value - be valueless - and have a value for a past expiration time. Applicant was informed that to overcome the Win reference substantial claim amendments would have to be made. At the end of the interview and after being previously asked for claim amendments three times to be considered during the interview, Applicant offered to prepare a claim amendment and have it reviewed before the six month deadline. Applicant was not granted a further interview to review Applicant's amendments before submission to the Office.